

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is requested.

Claims 1 and 6-23 remain in the application. Claims 2-5 were cancelled previously. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitations of claim 15. Claim 13 has been amended to ensure consistent use of terminology. Claim 14 has been amended into independent form. Claim 15 has been amended to depend from claim 14. New dependent claims 16-23 have been added and correspond respectively to claims 6-13. However, claims 16-23 depend from claim 15.

The Examiner objected to the drawings and required FIG. 2b to be identified as prior art.

A Replacement Sheet is attached and identifies both FIGS. 2a and 2b as prior art.

Claim 13 was rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph in view of the use of a term that did not have a proper antecedent basis.

Claim 13 has been amended to ensure proper terminology.

The Examiner identified claims 14 and 15 as being directed to patentable subject matter.

Allowable claim 15 had depended directly from claim 1. Claim 1 now has been amended to incorporate the limitations of allowable claim 15. Hence, claim 15 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Claims 6-13 depend from allowable claim 1 and should be allowed as well.

Allowable claim 14 had depended directly from claim 1. Claim 14 has been amended into independent form, with all of the limitations of claim 1. Hence,

amended claim 14 is believed to be in the condition for allowance. Claims 15-23 depend from claim 14 and should be allowed as well.

It is believed that these amendments place the application in condition for allowance. However, Examiner urged to contact applicant's attorney if any other issued need to be resolved.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerald E. Hespos, Esq.

Atty. Reg. No. 30,066

Customer No. 001218

CASELLA & HESPOS LLP

274 Madison Avenue - Suite 1703

New York, NY 10016

Tel. (212) 725-2450

Fax (212) 725-2452

Date: October 19, 2007